Dear Ted,

1/3/78

When my wife uses the copying machine again I'll be copying part of a personal letter for you. Because I have to protect my source I'll be eliminating some of it. My purpose in sending this to you is not to argue or to run Lane down but to let you know what he does all the time and people have no way of understanding. He is that skilled in his perpetual dishonesties.

You may remember that when you first told me of Lane's newest boasting about his personal investigations in the King assassination and you repeated what he had said I told you that I'd heard the same thing appeared in the National Enquirer. The writer was named Cobb. His source, as this letter says, was Renfron Hays. So naturally Mark is James Bond.

Note also - and I want you to please say nothing about this - that the stories contradict each other. ~~If~~ I mean Gracie's do.

I will also be enclosing, for your information, papers on the settling of John Henry Faulk's suit against Mark and others for $5,000. Settlement for $4,000 out of court is a rather high percentage.

Today I had to go to Washington for a molar extraction. Because of the medication I'm on the dentist did not want me to go by bus so I had a ride. I was able to listen to tapes both ways. I don't know what happened to the LA conspiracy symposium tapes but they are incomplete and repeat. Instead of the speeches by Lane and Phillips there was a repeat of the ACLU woman - the same thing twice. I do have the question period of Lane and Phillips. I have not finished hearing that. Quite worthwhile.

Some of what Mark said was quite fair and in point. Much was false. There was also a great amount of distortion. If Phillips knew the subject he'd have hurt Lane. The situation was very hurtful to Phillips, aside from his won record. If Lane really knew the material he could have done ever so much more. However, I also want you to know what Phillips did not know, that Hoover did not tell Rowley that FBI agents had heard the tape and said it was not Oswald's voice. I know this is what Lane has been saying. it is not what Hoover's letter says. It is typical Lane distortion and misrepresentation. That kind of thing can be used with great effectiveness in private, as on the Hill, with the Members.

I'd like very much to have their opening remarks. Phillips did spill a little but Lane did not take up on it. He went for a trick, saying he did not know that the records on critics or the memos had been sent abroad. Actually, they say so in the copies I have. Those records were for overseaes CIA stations, not those in the US, anyway.And as of that time what Lane was saying was grossly wrong, as Phillips did not know. not knowing the subject, the available material or what Lane was saying. Mark did get carried away a bit when he said his name is mentioned in the records, maybe the FBI's or the Commission's, more than Oswald's or JFK's or Ruby's. Nonsense. But he did say it - and got away with it.

In the earlier tapes there were similar duplications and omissions so you may have gotten confusged when you were dubbing and done the same things with others. Makes no difference to me because I'm sure that Colby and Kline said little or dropped little. Don't bother trying to dig out a set of their remarks.

Nothing new here. Hope you had a nice holiday.

Best,